

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Final Office Action dated April 5, 2011 and the Advisory Action dated July 18, 2011 have been received and the contents have been carefully reviewed.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0118327 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 to *Ito et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,853,841 to *St. Pierre*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,349,348 to *Anderson et al.*

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Claims 1-9, and 11-12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claim 10 has been amended. Support for the amendments can be found throughout the originally filed application, for example, in Figs. 2 and 4. No new matter is introduced.

New claim 14 has been added.

Accordingly, claims 10, 13, and 14 are currently pending. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration in view of the remarks presented herein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2003/0118327 to *Um et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,937,356 to *Ito et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,853,841 to *St. Pierre*, and U.S. Patent No. 5,349,348 to *Anderson et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses the claim rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 10, as amended, depicts a detailed configuration illustrated in Fig. 1, and a detailed operation illustrated in Fig. 4. Applicant respectfully submits that the applied art, whether taken alone or in combination, fails to disclose the newly cited feature.

In particular, claim 10 is amended to recite the control unit that determines whether or not a code of JFIF or a code of EXIF is included in the header of the still image file, when it is determined that the still image file has an extension of JPG and does not have a marker FFC2 in the range from the marker FFD8 to the marker FFDA. If neither the JFIF code nor the EXIF code is included in the header of the still image file, the control unit determines that the apparatus cannot reproduce the still image file and “the reproduction unit outputs the predetermined video signal,” as claimed. If either the JFIF code or the EXIF code is included in the header of the still image file, the control unit determines that the apparatus can reproduce the still image file and “the second decoding unit decodes the still image file and outputs the decoded still image file to the reproduction unit,” as claimed. Even when the extension of the still image file is JPG and the marker indicative of the progressive JPEG format is not present, there still remains a possibility that the still image file is not in fact compressed in the decodable JPEG format but compressed, for example, in the GIF format. With the operation newly added to claim 10, it is possible to reduce the time required to notify the user that the apparatus cannot reproduce the still image file even in such a situation (see page 12, line 22 – page 14, line 4 of the specification, and step S20 in Fig. 4).

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claim 10, as amended, is patentable over the applied art.

PATENT
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 040894-7000
Application No. 10/784,805

Furthermore, claims 13-14 depend from allowable independent 10, respectively.

Applicant respectfully asserts that these dependent claims also are allowable at least because of the additional features they recite and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested, and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

By: /Haining Shu/
Haining Shu
Reg. No. L0622

Dated: August 5, 2011

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Tel: 202.739.3000
Fax: 202.739.3001